

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 23-56 were presented for examination and claims 1-21 and 23-56 were rejected. In the present amendment, claims 1-9, 12, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27-29, 31-37, 39-42, 46, 48-50 and 53-56, and FIG. 4B have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-21 and 23-56 will be currently pending in this application, of which claims 1 and 35 are independent. Applicants submit that claims 1-21 and 23-56 are in condition for allowance.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102**II. Claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-54 as Anticipated by Pfitzner**

Claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-56 are rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0215826 A1 to Pfitzner ("Pfitzner") under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Claims 1 and 35 are independent claims. Claims 2-12, 20, 21, 23-34, 55 and 56 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 36-38 and 45-53 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35, as amended. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained over the claims as amended and submit that Pfitzner fails to disclose each and every element of the pending claims.

A. Independent Claims 1 and 35 Not Anticipated by Pfitzner

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Independent claims 1 and 35 recite an access control server making an access control decision to determine a level of access granted to the client node and transmitting a second file to the client node responsive to the determined level of access granted to the client node for the contents of the file. The second file is executable by the client node and has a file type different from the native file type of the requested file. These claims further recite establishing a connection to an application server via execution of the second file on the client node and presenting, by an application program executing on the application server, the contents of the file to the client node via the established connection. Pfitzner fails to disclose each and every element of the claims 1 and 35.

Pfitzner fails to disclose (1) making an access control decision to determine a level of access granted to the client node and (2) transmitting a second file to the client node responsive to the determined level of access. Pfitzner is directed to a system for accessing a business object suitably formatted for a requesting client node (*Pfitzner*, para. 39, lines 1-4, and para. 41, lines 11-15). Pfitzner merely determines a location for downloading data of a format supported by the client node but does not limit access in any way (*Pfitzner*, para. 37, lines 3-5, and the translation table). Therefore, Pfitzner fails to contemplate granting a level of access to the client node for the contents of the file based on an access control decision. Consequently, Pfitzner also fails to disclose transmitting a second file to the client node responsive to any determined level of access granted to the client node.

In addition, Pfitzner does not disclose transmitting a second file executable by the client node that has a file type different from the native file type of the requested file, and establishing a connection to an application server via execution of the second file on the client node. As discussed, Pfitzner merely returns a reference address (such as a URL link) to the client node. Such an address or URL link is not a file, nor is it executable by the client node. Even if one infers that the transmission of such an address or URL link occurs via a message, that message is neither executable nor specified to have a file type different from the native file type of the requested file. Thus, Pfitzner also fails to disclose establishing a connection to an application server via execution on the client node of a second file having a file type different from the requested file.

Because Pfitzner fails to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1 and 35, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 35 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 2-13, 20, 21, 23-34, 55 and 56 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 36-38 and 45-53 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35. Thus, claims 2-13, 20, 21, 23-34, 36-38 and 45-56 are also patentable and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-13, 20, 21, 23-38 and 45-56 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

III. Claims 14-19 and 39-44 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 14-16 and 39-44 are rejected as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,581 B1 to Hofmann et al. ("Hofmann") under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claim 17 is rejected

as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0023421 A1 to Numao et al. ("Numao") under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 18 and 19 are rejected as unpatentable over Pfitzner in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,868,451 B1 to Peacock ("Peacock") under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1, as amended. Claims 39-44 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35, as amended. Applicants traverse these rejections and submit that Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims 14-19 and 39-44.

A. Dependent claims 14-19, 39-44 Patentable over Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock

In view of the arguments above in connection with the rejection of independent claims 1 and 35, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 35 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Claims 14-19 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 1. Claims 39-44 depend on and incorporate all of the patentable subject matter of independent claim 35. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 14-19 and 39-44 are also patentable and in condition for allowance.

The arguments made above with respect to Pfitzner apply with equal force here and are reiterated as if set forth in full. The Examiner cites Hofmann simply for a discovery agent feature, Numao merely for an access control server to reject a request, and Peacock merely for identifying a file type from a file extension. As with Pfitzner, the Hofmann, Numao and Peacock references do not teach or suggest transmitting to the client node, responsive to the determined level of access, a second file executable by the client node and having a file type different from the native file type of the requested file, establishing a connection to an application server via execution of the second file on the client node, and presenting, by an application program

executing on the application server, the contents of the file to the client node via the connection. Therefore, Applicants submit that the combination of Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao and Peacock fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 35.

Because Pfitzner, Hofmann, Numao, and Peacock, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1 and 35, Applicants submit that these references fail to detract from the patentability of independent claims 1 and 35 and dependent claims 14-19 and 39-44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 14-19 and 39-44 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned amendments and arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections has been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number identified below. Please charge any additional fees that may be required or credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 03-1721.

Respectfully submitted,

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Dated: August 28, 2009

/John D. Lanza/

John D. Lanza

Registration No. 40,060

Attorney for Applicant

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP

2 International Place

Boston, MA 02110

(617) 248-5000